

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application. Claim 1, 3, 4, 11 and 13 were amended in this response. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendment.

Claims 1-7 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Leppinen* (US Patent 6,735,186). Claims 8, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Leppinen* (US Patent 6,735,186) in view of *Lee* (US Patent 6,609,150) were rejected under. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The cited art, alone or in combination, does not disclose “establishing and maintaining, in the IP network, a first session based on an application-level protocol via a user interface that is unrestricted at least on an output side” and “establishing and maintaining, in the IP network and in parallel with the first session, a second session based on at least one of a restricted wireless application communication protocol, and a restricted user interface” as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 11. Regarding the claim terminology, the present specification provides:

In addition to the embodiment mentioned a number of times above, with a WAP mobile telephone as a terminal with restricted protocol capability with regard to the standard IP protocol, the present invention also can be embodied with a data terminal which, although designed to process the standard IP protocol, nevertheless has restricted input and/or output possibilities; for example, via a display screen of small size and/or resolution. The present invention also can be embodied with mobile radio terminals of future generations (in particular, UMTS terminals) which are largely adapted to the processing of HTTP or TCP but necessarily have a small display and do not have a full alphanumeric keyboard. For devices of this type, the term "restricted user interface" is used in the appended claims.

(page 8, lines 21-30; see also page 2, lines 23-24 and page 3, lines 21-29).

Under the disclosure of *Leppinen*, only one user interface is present at the mobile station 12. This user interface, however, represents a *restricted* user interface, since it is a user interface of a mobile telephone with a small display. Furthermore, *Leppinen* only discloses the setup of a *single session* by the mobile station 12, namely by a restricted user interface. The single session transmits data from the web server 14 to the mobile station 12 (col. 3, line 7 to line 11).

In addition, *Leppinen* only discloses a first mobile radio terminal with restricted WAP protocol capability towards a HTTP protocol and restricted user interface. The first mobile radio terminal is disclosed in the form of the mobile station 12. *Leppinen* does not disclose a second terminal with full protocol capability with regard to the HTTP protocol and unrestricted user interface as required in claim 11. Given the system of *Leppinen*, only one single terminal is used in the form of the mobile station 12; a second terminal is not used. Furthermore, *Leppinen* only sets up one single session upon use of one single terminal - as explained above in connection with claim 1.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn. Furthermore, as *Lee* does not solve the deficiencies of *Leppinen*, discussed above, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 must also fall.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. As such, claims 1-13 of the present application are patentable over the art of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



Peter Zura

Reg. No. 48,196

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: May 9, 2005